

11/3/2016

Online: Maddie, Katie Moore, Allison Reed, Randy Kirkland, Brett, Sara Beale, Barrie Selcoe, Dave Boehnker

1. Amount of characterization needed (nature and extent, uncertainty, hot spots)
 - Management strategy is in accordance with NCP Section 300.430(a)(2). The purpose of the remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) is to assess site conditions and evaluate alternatives to the extent necessary to select a remedy...The scope and timing of these activities should be tailored to the nature and complexity of the problem and the response alternatives being considered.
 - Narrow the RI/FS activities to those that make sense given the information we already have.
 - Areas of concern for containment include: TCE plume around MW-229, MW-210, BH70-13, VC plume
 - Off-site waste: What are the indications that there might be waste off site? If we look at the existing boring logs, aerial photos of waste and excavated areas, and ownership records, and all of those support the conclusion that solid waste is not expected outside of OU1, what is the driver to go looking for it?
 - Nature: the types of contaminants are known; VOCs, metals, etc. The types of waste accepted are known. What more is needed?
 - Vertical extent: see figure 2.2; what more is needed?
2. Consideration of future land use and likely remedies (containment of GW or treatment/removal of source areas; containment/prevention of direct exposure from landfill contents; collection/treatment/venting of landfill gas/soil vapor or treatment/removal of source)
 - Containment is still the likely remedy for landfill contents. "Containment has generally been identified as the most practicable remedial technology for municipal landfills because the volume and heterogeneity of landfill contents often makes treatment impracticable. Characterization of municipal landfill contents therefore is generally not necessary because containment of the landfill contents do not require such information."
 - Property owners indicate an eagerness to place an IC on their property to restrict use; it is reasonable to assume that they will in fact do this.
 - One concern is to make sure that we have enough information to evaluate hot spot removal and/or treatment. Areas of potential PTW have been identified but they aren't hot spots because they are spread across the landfill.
3. ARARs; also, until there are ARARs, the process is the CERCLA process that has some flexibility to include state approaches, but we don't have the flexibility to contradict the CERCLA process
 - ARAR: no formal determination until the time of the ROD. Until then, we look ahead and consider what potential remedies there could be. Could be that the ARAR will drive the remedy; or could be that direct contact risk needs prevention; VI risk needs prevention; groundwater plumes that go off site need treatment, MNA or containment.
4. Background comparisons

11/3/2016

Online: Maddie, Katie Moore, Allison Reed, Randy Kirkland, Brett, Sara Beale, Barrie Selcoe, Dave Boehnker

5. Quarry Pond
6. River and floodplain

Their big picture issue is that this is risk assessment and doesn't delineate nature and extent. We have a lot of data, but having all these other investigations

It may be they have enough to know lateral extent of waste, it was just looking at risk assessment. Waste placement on quarry pond parcels; direct contact. Defining nature and extent. If they want to evaluate remedies other than cap and containment, they didn't present the data in a way that was apparent, may be they have the data.

They want an explanation of why.